



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/694,138

10/27/2003

Lee C. Moore

D/A2471

3243

7590 04/09/2008
Ortiz & Lopez, PLLC
P.O. Box 4484
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484

EXAMINER

MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/694,138	Applicant(s) MOORE, LEE C.	
	Examiner GABRIELLE MCCORMICK	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the amendment filed on March 6, 2008.
2. Claims 1,2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-20 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Objections

4. The Examiner thanks the Applicant for the amendments made to claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 to overcome the previously cited objections.
5. Claim 18 is objected to for labeling the amended claim as "Original". The claim should be properly labeled as "Currently Amended". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. The Examiner thanks the Applicant for the amendments made to claims 1-20 to overcome previously cited rejections.
8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
9. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the print on demand system performs the printing of the at least one publication and binding of the at least one publication block". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase "the print on demand system", "the printing...and binding" and "the at least one publication block".

Art Unit: 3629

10. Claims 5 and 9 are unclear in the use of the phrase, "the selection". In claim 5, line 2, "the selection" appears to relate back to claim 1, line 11 where the traveler makes a selection of a publication. In lines 3-4 of claim 5, "the selection" now seems to refer to the product of the print on demand system, therefore, this term, if different from the previous use and understanding, is unclear. Claim 9, lines 2 and 3, the use of the term "the selection" is unclear as to whether it relates back to "the selection" of claim 1 or "the selection" referring to the product of the print on demand system of claim 5, lines 3-4.
11. Claim 8 refers to "an electronic interface" including "systems". It is unclear how a single interface includes a plurality.
12. Claim 13 recites, "the printing of the publication and publication cover and the binding of the publication block". There is insufficient antecedent basis for "the printing", "the binding" and "the publication block".
13. Claim 18 recites "receiving...orders from travelers using **an** electron interface" and "destinations that can be selected by the travelers for obtaining **the** purchase selection". It is unclear how a plurality of travelers uses a single interface for ordering and how a single selection is selected by a plurality of travelers and obtained at a plurality of destinations.
14. Claim 19 refers to "the traveler's identity" (singular) whereas amended claim 18 only refers to a plurality of travelers, therefore, this term lacks insufficient antecedent basis.
15. Claim 20 refers to "the electronic interface" including "kiosks,...systems or...appliances". It is unclear how a single interface includes a plurality.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. **Claims 1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundgren (US Pub. No. 2003/0048471) in view of Marsh (US Pub. No. 2002/0061238) in view of Ross (US Pat. No. 5,465,213).
18. **Claims 1 and 3-20:** Lundgren discloses providing aircraft passengers (i.e., travelers) with Internet access (para. [0003]) whereby a "laptop computer or handheld computer" is connected "to an Internet web site for accessing a printing management application" where printing is performed "at a designated airport or at other locations designated by the user." (para. [0007]). When selecting the printing and delivery options, including printing to printers at airports, the traveler is able to electronically select production facilities near the traveler's destination. (para. [0018]). The document is printed at the location specified by the traveler and is picked up "at the airport after the aircraft has landed." (para. [0020]), thus the document is distributed to a pick-up facility as chosen by the traveler. Lundgren discloses that documents can be reviewed from the Internet (para. [0004]). In this regard, it is obvious that documents that are reviewed from the Internet include previously published works, i.e., *publications*. Therefore, publications are ordered from the Internet when the traveler provides user ID and billing information to the printing services application (para. [0018]). Lundgren further discloses requiring "user identification (ID) and account information, including billing information such as a credit card number" be provided to the printing services application. This information is used to "track any print job initiated through the printing services application." (para. [0018]). It is obvious that upon pick-up of the selection, the

traveler's identity would be authenticated in that the print order would be matched against the user ID and the billing information provided by the traveler when the selection was ordered. A remote pick-up location would be motivated to verify customer IDs and account information to ensure that print orders are released to the customer who ordered it. By teaching a system where on-board and remote printing operations of documents on the Internet (P[004]) are performed for a fee, printing on demand is performed.

19. Lundgren does not disclose *a catalog from which publications can be selected* or that the print on demand system prints a publication cover and binds the publication block of the selection from the catalog. Lundgren does disclose Internet access during a flight where travelers can access Internet services. This disclosure of Internet access during a flight obviously includes access to web based businesses.
20. Marsh discloses an online system for ordering and printing books on demand in which customers access via the Internet to view the books in the digital library (i.e., preview the books in a catalog or database), select and order the book and command the book to be printed, bound and trimmed. (P[0112]). Marsh also points to US Pat. No. 5,465,213 (Ross) as providing the teaching for accessing via the Internet to order a book to be printed on demand. (P[0112]).
21. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included selecting and previewing publications to be printed from an online catalog, as disclosed by Marsh in the system disclosed by Lundgren, for the motivation of providing a convenient means of shopping. Catalogs are an old and well known form of perusing items available for purchase that affords the customer convenience. By having provided Internet access to airline passengers, Lundgren foresaw the use of Internet shopping, and therefore, the obvious need for catalogs (Lundgren; para. [0003]: the system offers "Internet services while in-flight"). Therefore, ordering anything from the Internet, including books to be printed on demand, is an obvious expansion of Lundgren's system.
22. Ross discloses a kiosk based system where a customer views "promotional sales information" (i.e., a catalog), purchases the book through system which initiates printing of the book and cover

and finally binding. (C1; L55 – C2; L32). Ross discloses that the “floor space required for the book manufacturing system...is somewhat larger than an ordinary office desk...” (C2; L57-59). Ross also discloses using a WAN for a user to select a book where the WAN includes “satellite communications”. (C12; L38-56).

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have expanded the system of Lundgren to include the print on demand system of Ross/Marsh wherein a book is order via the Internet and printed and bound with a cover since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.
24. Specifically, it is predictable that the system of Lundgren, which discloses ordering and purchasing printed documents, when expanded to include the automatic thermal binding machine which is used to bind the text pages into the cover (Ross; C2; L27-29), would still perform the function of printing ordered documents. As the floor space requirements for the entire book manufacturing system of Ross is “somewhat larger than an ordinary office desk”, it is obvious that the system of Lundgren would be capable of the expansion to include the added binding machine.
25. **Claim 2:** Lundgren/Marsh/Ross does not explicitly disclose that *the catalog can be made available in printed form*, however, it is obvious that airlines provide in-flight catalogs, such as “SkyMall”, therefore it is obvious to expand the combined system of Lundgren/Marsh/Ross to include a printed catalog. One would be motivated to do so in order to minimize both the cost of the in-flight Internet access and the use of the laptop battery. By providing a printed catalog, the traveler is able to leisurely peruse the selections available then connect to the Internet just to make the purchase.

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
27. Applicant argues that Lundgren does not disclose receiving an electronic order for a publication. The Examiner disagrees. Lundgren teaches a system where on-board and remote printing operations of documents selected from the Internet (P[004]) are performed for a fee, thus an electronic order is received such that the specified Internet based document (i.e., a publication) is paid for, printed and picked up by the customer. (P[0018]).
28. As a result of the amendments to the claims, the Examiner has introduced Ross to further disclose a print on demand for ordering books via a WAN (i.e. Internet) connection. The Examiner has also clarified how one of ordinary skill in the art would have expanded Lundgren to include the elements of March and Ross (discussed above).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabrielle McCormick whose telephone number is (571)270-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (5:30 - 4:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629